



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,476	07/24/2003	Mark Ruttenberg	717958.8	1475
27128	7590	12/14/2005	EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL SANDERS PEPER MARTIN LLP 720 OLIVE STREET SUITE 2400 ST. LOUIS, MO 63101				BODDIE, WILLIAM
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2674		

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/604,476	RUTTENBERG, MARK
	Examiner	Art Unit
	William Boddie	2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 7/26/2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/27/03, 11/1/03

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraphs 68 and 75, it appears that the applicant intended for the “unshaped” frame and channel to actually read: “u-shaped” frame and channel. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the system of claim 11 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Claim 11 states that the display panels are mounted *within* a support frame with at least one arm *between* the support frame and the display panel. Upon examination this embodiment was not seen in any of the drawings supplied to date.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: it appears applicant intended the cited "unshaped frame" to read "u-shaped frame". Claim 20 will be examined based on this assumption. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: both the splitter and the video receiver phrases contain awkward language with seemingly unintended words in the claim; "is operatively" for example. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 11-12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
7. Claim 11 as discussed above in Drawings includes the limitation that the display panels are mounted within a support frame. Later in claim 11, applicant states that an arm is attached between the support frame and the display panel. These two limitations appear to be contradictory. After examination of the specification and drawings as a

whole it appears applicant intended for claim 11 to be drawn to figures 8-11. Claims 11-12 will therefore be examined based on this assumption.

8. Claim 20 recites the limitation "the at least one backing member" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears that the applicant intended for this claim to actually be dependent upon claim 17 instead of claim 7. Claim 20 will be examined based on this assumption.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1,3,6,13,15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946).

With respect to claim 1, Pettus discloses an octagon shaped video advertising display module. The plural display panels all point in generally different directions (see drawings). At least one of the panels is a video display (electronic panel) as stated by the title and description of figure 1. The remaining panels of Pettus are clearly capable of displaying visual advertising information.

Pettus does not expressly disclose a source of electronic advertising information operable associated with the at least one electronic display panel for displaying the electronic visual advertising information on the at least one electronic panel display.

Berry discloses, a source of electronic advertising information (60 in fig. 5, also note col. 3, lines 40-45) for use with a multi-panel electronic panel display (fig. 1).

Berry and Pettus are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, multi-panel video displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to drive the displays of Pettus in the manner of transmitting video signals as taught by Berry.

The motivation for doing so would have been so that audiences at different locations may view the screens and hear the program simultaneously (Berry, col. 3, lines 49-52).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Berry with Pettus for the benefit of allowing audiences at different angles to see the same video source to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With respect to claim 3, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 1 (see above).

Pettus further discloses, a support device (note the overall enclosure and pole of the drawings) associated with the plurality of display panels supporting the plurality of display panels in an elevated position.

While Pettus does not expressly disclose the purpose of the display module, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the display module in a retail outlet.

With respect to claim 6, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 1 (see above).

Berry further discloses, including a support frame (22 in fig. 3, col. 3, lines 5-7) that is operatively connected to the plurality of display panels (25 and 28 in fig. 3).

With respect to claim 13, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 1 (see above).

Berry further discloses, the source of the electronic advertising information for the at least one electronic display panel is digitally stored (col. 2, lines 9-11, discusses the use of a tape recording to store the information).

With respect to claim 15, Pettus and Berry disclose the advertising display as set forth in claim 1 (see above).

Berry further discloses, further including a plurality of the advertising displays (56-61 in fig. 5) connected to the source of electronic advertising information (note fig. 5), wherein the plurality of electronic advertising displays are positioned in a spaced apart relationship (col. 3, lines 32-39).

With respect to claim 16, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 15 (see above).

Berry further discloses, wherein the source of advertising information (60 in fig. 5) including digitally stored advertising information (cassette tape, col. 2, lines 9-15) provided to the plurality advertising displays (56-61 in fig. 5), wherein the plurality of advertising displays are operatively connected to at least one splitter (70 in fig. 5), wherein the at least one splitter is operatively connected to at least one video receiver

(23 in fig. 5), wherein the at least one video receiver is operatively connected to at least one video transmitter (60 in fig. 5).

While Berry does not explicitly disclose at least one processor that utilizes the digitally stored advertising information, this is inherent. Berry discloses a videocassette that would have had to process/decode the data located on the pre-tape recorded cassette (col. 2, lines 5-15).

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) and further in view of Pellenberg et al. (US 5,663,746).

With respect to claim 2, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 1 (see above).

While Pettus appears to display printed advertising on alternating panels, Neither Pettus or Berry expressly disclose, wherein the visual advertising information includes at least one printed advertisement.

Pellenberg discloses, an interactive video kiosk (fig. 1) that also displays printed advertisements (96 in fig. 1b; col. 7, lines 66-67 – col. 8, line 1)

Pettus, Berry and Pellenberg are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely, video display kiosks.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include printed advertisements, as taught by Pellenberg, on the additional panels of the display kiosk of Pettus and Berry.

The motivation for doing so would have been to present advertising to any person looking at the display kiosk, regardless of angle relative to the kiosk.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Pellenberg with Pettus and Berry for the benefit of advertising to anyone regardless of viewing angle to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

12. Claims 4, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) and further in view of Kim (US 2004/0046704).

With respect to claim 4, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 3 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Berry expressly discloses, wherein at least one of the display panels of the plurality of display panels of the plurality of display panels is moveable relative to the support device.

Kim discloses, a plurality of display panels (12 in fig. 6) that are moveable (ball joint in fig. 6) relative to the support device (16,24,20 in fig. 6).

Pettus, Berry and Kim are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely multi-panel video display systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the displays of the Pettus/Berry system on the ball joints taught by Kim.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the best angle of vision for the user (Kim, para. 42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kim, Berry and Pettus for the benefit of a better angle of vision to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

With respect to claim 5, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 3 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Berry explicitly discloses, at least one of the display panels of the plurality of display panels being moveable relative to at least one of the other display panels of the plurality of display panels.

Kim discloses, a plurality of display panels (4 in fig. 6) that are moveable (ball joint in fig. 6) relative to the each other (16,24,20 in fig. 6; note that the ball joint is attached to each panel, thereby allowing for different orientations from panel to panel).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the displays of the Pettus/Berry system on the ball joints taught by Kim.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the best angle of vision for the user (Kim, para. 42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kim, Berry and Pettus for the benefit of a better angle of vision to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

With respect to claim 10, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 6 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Berry expressly discloses further including at least one attachment mechanism connected to the at least one electronic panel display and connected to the support frame.

Kim discloses, an attachment mechanism (ball joint in fig. 5) to connect an electronic display (12 in fig. 5) to a support frame (8 in fig. 5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the displays of the Pettus/Berry system on the ball joints taught by Kim.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the best angle of vision for the user (Kim, para. 42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kim, Berry and Pettus for the benefit of a better angle of vision to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) and further in view of Lollos et al. (US 3,727,000).

With respect to claim 7, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 6 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Berry expressly discloses, wherein the support frame includes a plurality of angle brackets.

Lollos discloses, a support frame constructed from angle brackets (fig. 1).

Lollos, Pettus and Berry are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely, multi-panel display systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include angle brackets as taught by Lollos in the construction of the support structure, of the display system of Pettus and Berry.

The motivation for doing so would have been their prevalence in support structures, also angle brackets provide for very stable transitions from panel to panel in geometric designs such as those used in the combination of Pettus and Berry.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Lollos with Pettus and Berry for the benefit of stable transitions to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

14. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) and further in view of White (US 4,608,773).

With respect to claim 8, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 6 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Berry expressly discloses, that the support frame includes a plurality of wall members.

White discloses a support frame that is constructed from a plurality of wall members (for example fig. 7).

White, Pettus and Berry are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely, multi-paneled display systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the wall members, taught by White, as the polygonal support frame of the display system of Pettus and Berry.

The motivation for doing so would have been the inexpensive cost of the wall members (White, col. 1, lines 31-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine White with Pettus and Berry for the benefit of lessened cost to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

With respect to claim 9, Pettus, Berry and White disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 8 (see above).

White further teaches, wherein the plurality of wall members each include a top flange portion (104 in fig. 6) located on the top of each of the plurality of wall members and a bottom flange portion (106 in fig. 6) located on the bottom of each of the plurality of wall members.

15. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirshhorn (US 2003/0235320) in view of Pettus (US D380,011).

With respect to claim 11, Hirshhorn discloses, an arm (128 in fig. 5) that is attached between a support frame (138 in fig. 5) and an electronic display (102 in fig. 5). The arm allows the display to be pivoted in at least one direction (page 7, para. 77). Hirshhorn further discloses a video source for displaying video on the electronic display (150 in fig. 5).

Hirshhorn does not expressly disclose, a plurality of displays being mounted to the support frame, and the displays being used for advertising purposes.

Pettus discloses, multiple video displays being mounted together within one support frame (fig. 4) as well as the displays being used for advertising purposes (see title).

Hirshhorn and Pettus are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, video display panels.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount at least three display panels, as taught by Pettus, to the flexible arms of Hirshhorn.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow additional users, at different positions, to view the video display.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Pettus with Hirshhorn for the benefit of greater accessibility to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

With respect to claim 12, Hirshhorn and Pettus disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 11 (see above).

Hirshhorn further discloses, utilizing flexible tubing (128 in fig. 5), shims (382 in fig. 17,18,19; also see para. 105), and at least one swivel joint (210 in fig. 7 for example) in the arms.

16. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) and further in view of Hoarty (US 5,485,197).

With respect to claim 14, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 1 (see above) wherein the source of the electronic advertising information for the at least one electronic display panel is from a network (fig. 5).

Neither Pettus nor Berry expressly discloses that the network is a global computer network.

Hoarty discloses connecting multiple electronic displays (13 in fig. 1) together with a global computer network (fig. 1, also 25 in fig. 3 has regional servers, also note fig. 5) to supply them with advertising information (regional advertisers in fig. 1).

Pettus, Berry and Hoarty are all analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely sending video signals to a number of electronic video displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the network of the Berry/Pettus system with the global computer network taught by Hoarty.

The motivation for doing so would have been to send computerized data to electronic displays in vastly different locations.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Hoarty with Berry and Pettus for the benefit of sending computerized data to displays to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

17. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) and further in view of Hubbard, II (US 2002/0108279).

With respect to claim 17, Pettus and Berry disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 6 (see above).

Neither Pettus or Berry expressly disclose, further including an exterior shell, having at least one opening therein, and positioned over at least one backing member, wherein the at least one backing member is positioned adjacent to the support frame and the exterior shell and the at least one backing member are operatively connected

together to form a pocket for receiving a removable printed advertisement so that the printed advertisement can be viewed through the at least one opening in the exterior shell.

Hubbard discloses, an exterior shell (fig. 1) with several openings (18 in fig. 2 for example). Hubbard also teaches a backing member (30 in fig. 5) that is operatively connected (38 in fig. 5, also note page 2, left col., ¾'s down) with the shell and thereby form a pocket for a removable printed advertisement (26 in fig. 5) that is viewed through the opening (18 in fig. 5).

Pettus, Berry, and Hubbard are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely multiple panel displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the exterior shell and backing member taught by Hubbard over the multi-panel display system of Pettus and Berry.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional surfaces for advertising, and also to present a more flattering appearance (Hubbard, page 1, para. 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Pettus and Berry with Hubbard for the benefit of a more flattering appearance to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

With respect to claim 18, Pettus, Berry and Hubbard disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 17 (see above).

Hubbard further teaches, wherein the exterior shell and the at least one backing member includes polymeric material (page 1, para. 9; teaches a die cut corrugated plastic as the material of the box of Hubbard).

With respect to claim 19, Pettus, Berry and Hubbard disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 18 (see above).

Hubbard further discloses using vinyl (a polyvinyl chloride material) to create a window (para. 9).

While neither Pettus, Betty or Hubbard explicitly disclose that the shell and backing member are a moderately expanded, rigid polyvinyl chloride material; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a moderately expanded, rigid polyvinylchloride material (taught by Hubbard) in the shell and backing member of the advertising display of Pettus, Betty and Hubbard.

The motivation for doing so would have been the prevalence of rigid pvc in the art as an encasement and structure material. An additional reason for the use of pvc is due to its water-resistance (Hubbard, page 2, last sentence of col. 1).

18. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Berry (US 4,303,946) in view of Hubbard, II (US 2002/0108279) and further in view of Brody (US 2,636,702).

With respect to claim 20, Pettus, Berry and Hubbard disclose, the electronic advertising display as set forth in claim 17 (see above).

Hubbard further discloses a rectangular shaped frame (22 in fig. 5) and a backing member (36 in fig. 5) that includes at least one stop for limiting longitudinal movement of

the exterior shell in relationship to the support frame (see fig. 6 and the inclusion of the backing member on the top of the structure stops the longitudinal movement of the shell).

Neither Pettus, Berry nor Hubbard expressly discloses a u-shaped frame, wherein the u-shaped frame is attached to the exterior shell.

Brody discloses a u-shaped frame (11 and 14 in fig. 1).

Pettus, Berry, Hubbard and Brody are all analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, advertising panel displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the rectangular frame of the Pettus, Berry, and Hubbard system with the u-shaped frame of Brody.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a simple sliding of advertisements in and out of the display (Brody, col. 2, lines 50-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine, Pettus, Berry and Hubbard with Brody, for the benefit of simply sliding advertisements in and out of the display panel to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

19. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Pellenberg et al. (US 5,663,746).

With respect to claim 21, Pettus discloses, With respect to claim 1, Pettus discloses an octagon shaped video advertising display module. The plural display panels all point in generally different directions (see drawings). Also at least one of the

panels is a video display (electronic panel) as stated by the title and description of figure 1.

While Pettus appears to display printed advertising on alternating panels, Pettus does not expressly disclose, displaying printed advertisements on the remaining display panels of the plurality of display panels.

Pellenberg discloses, an interactive video kiosk (fig. 1) that also displays printed advertisements (96 in fig. 1b; col. 7, lines 66-67 – col. 8, line 1)

Pettus and Pellenberg are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely, video display kiosks.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include printed advertisements, as taught by Pellenberg, on the additional panels of the display kiosk of Pettus.

The motivation for doing so would have been present advertising to any person looking at the display kiosk, regardless of angle relative to the kiosk.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Pellenberg with Pettus for the benefit of advertising to anyone regardless of viewing angle to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

With respect to claim 22, Pettus and Pellenberg disclose, the method of claim 21 (see above).

Pettus further discloses, a support device (note the overall enclosure and pole of the drawings) associated with the plurality of display panels supporting the plurality of display panels in an elevated position.

While Pettus does not expressly disclose the purpose of the display module, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the display module in a retail outlet.

20. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Pellenberg et al. (US 5,663,746) and further in view of Kim (US 2004/0046704).

With respect to claim 23, Pettus and Pellenberg disclose, the advertising display as set forth in claim 22 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Pellenberg expressly disclose, wherein at least one of the display panels of the plurality of display panels of the plurality of display panels is moveable relative to the support device.

Kim discloses, a plurality of display panels (12 in fig. 6) that are moveable (ball joint in fig. 6) relative to the support device (16,24,20 in fig. 6) and moveable relative to the other displays (16,24,20 in fig. 6; note that the ball joint is attached to each panel, thereby allowing for different orientations from panel to panel).

Pettus, Pellenberg and Kim are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely multi-panel display kiosks.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the displays of the Pettus/Pellenberg system on the ball joints taught by Kim.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the best angle of vision for the user (Kim, para. 42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kim, Pellenberg and Pettus for the benefit of a better angle of vision to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

21. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Pellenberg et al. (US 5,663,746) and further in view of Berry (US 4,303,946).

With respect to claim 24, Pettus and Pellenberg disclose the method as set forth in claim 21 (see above).

Neither Pettus nor Pellenberg disclose positioning a plurality of advertising displays, which are connected to electronic advertising information, in a spaced apart relationship.

Berry discloses, including a plurality of the advertising displays (56-61 in fig. 5) connected to the source of electronic advertising information (note fig. 5), wherein the plurality of electronic advertising displays are positioned in a spaced apart relationship (col. 3, lines 32-39).

Pettus, Pellenberg, and Berry are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely, multi-panel display kiosks.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to position a plurality of Pettus/Pellenberg advertising displays in a spaced apart relationship as taught by Berry.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to allow people in different areas of a building to view advertising information (col. 3, lines 32-39).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Berry with Pettus and Pellenberg for the benefit of wide area advertising to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

With respect to claim 25, Pettus, Pellenberg and Berry disclose, the method as set forth in claim 24 (see above).

The remaining limitations of claim 25 have all been previously addressed in the rejection of claim 16. As Berry teaches these additional limitations, claim 25 is rejected on the grounds shown above in claim 16.

22. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus (US D380,011) in view of Pellenberg et al. (US 5,663,746) and further in view of Hubbard, II (US 2002/0108279).

With respect to claim 26, Pettus and Pellenberg disclose, the method as set forth in claim 21 (see above).

As shown in the rejection of claim 17, Hubbard, II teaches the remaining limitations of claim 26.

Pettus, Pellenberg, and Hubbard, II are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor namely, multi-panel displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the exterior shell and backing member taught by Hubbard over the multi-panel display system of Pettus and Pellenberg.

The motivation for doing so would have been provide additional surfaces for advertising, and also to present a more flattering appearance (Hubbard, page 1, para. 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Pettus and Pellenberg with Hubbard for the benefit of a more flattering appearance to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Will Boddie whose telephone number is (571) 272-0666. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Wlb
12-5-05